

**Minutes**  
**Toll Bridge Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting of October 11, 2002**

**Meeting Schedule**

<b>October 18</b>	Discussion of Strengths and Weakness of Projects serving the Bay Bridge and San Mateo/Dumbarton bridges.
<b>October 25</b>	Discussion of Strengths and Weakness of Projects in system-wide category, and serving the Carquinez, and Antioch-Benicia/Martinez bridges.
<b>November 1</b>	Presentation of projects with initial rankings

\*All meetings to be held at 2pm, in the Alameda County CMA Offices located in downtown Oakland at 1333 Broadway, Suite 220.

**Discussion of Projects Listed by Bridge Corridor**

Ezra Rapport presented the first draft of a summary of the project requests, listed by bridge groups (Bay Bridge, San Mateo-Hayward/Dumbarton, Benicia-Antioch/Martinez, and Carquinez) and one system-wide category. A question was asked as to why the capital corridor project wasn't system-wide. Ezra responded that he would examine the capital corridor issue more closely, and that projects were categorized based on their primary corridor. Another question was asked as to why AC Transit's proposed owl service was system-wide. Ezra responded that the owl service links to BART stations, so if you accept that BART is a regional system, then the owl service should be as well. Another question was asked as to why e-bart is listed under the Antioch-Benicia/Martinez bridge group when it also serves the Bay Bridge. Ezra replied that the bridge group that a project is listed under does not dictate how much funding it receives or a restriction on identifying funds in other relevant bridge corridors.

**Discussion of Performance Measure Criteria**

Rod McMillan (MTC) presented assessment measures for the committee's consideration regarding the project evaluation that MTC is performing. With regard to nexus, there were many questions about the proposed measurements (extent that service provides direct transbay service, whether and extent that service directly impacts a major bridge approach, and percent of travel market served by the project that makes a transbay trip). One committee member suggested that we should also look at the percent of bridge users that originate in area that project would serve.

Jose Luis Moscovich (SF Transportation Authority) suggested that the first bullet (percent of toll funds requested of total bridge/bridge group funds available) be removed, as it could be a lightning rod used to dismiss a worthwhile project. The committee appeared to be in agreement with this request.

Dennis Fay (Alameda County CMA) asked that we have an attorney come to the committee to discuss the nexus issue. Ezra responded that after the election we will solicit legal counsel, but for now it was agreed that we would proceed with a preliminary analysis of nexus and finalize after we have legal review.

Howard Goode (Samtrans) said he thinks of nexus as having an impact on congestion. Ezra replied that determining nexus could also be considered a mitigation fee where increased mobility in the corridor is the primary justification.. Pam Belchamber (City of Vallejo) suggested that consideration be given for longer trips as it relates to cost effectiveness. Paul Maxwell (Contra Costa Transportation Authority) said that he is not comfortable with including cost effectiveness as a measure since it is so difficult to develop accurate ridership projections. In response, Dennis Fay suggested that we develop a high/med/low measure that would compare projects using the same measurements so as to develop a standardized measurement. It was agreed that whatever measure is provided, there should be a comment next to it to explain the basis for the numbers.

Nina Rannels (Golden Gate) asked how we would evaluate highway projects. Ezra replied that they would only be evaluated in the context of how they improve transit service/access to transit.

### **Toll Revenue Discussion**

Dennis Fay discussed how much revenue would be generated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> dollar. He suggested that we should consider leaving some funds available for the Legislature to program — so that projects that are included in the initial expenditure plan aren't forced to downsize or drop out to accommodate legislative priorities. Ezra responded that he agreed with the idea of a cushion in the funds — but that this could also come from the reserve due to the fact that projects won't draw down the funds right away. Paul Maxwell said that we should also estimate pay-as-you-go revenues generated because we might not need to issue bonds. Jose Luis Moscovich responded that it wouldn't be prudent to not assume that at least 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the program would be bonded. A question was asked as to who should pay the interest on the bonds — the program or individual project sponsors? Rod McMillan said that the assumptions MTC has made to date assume that the program would bear the costs.

### **Revenue/Capital Split & Sustainability Discussion**

Ezra stated that he is not committed to a rigid 50/50 split between capital and operations funding. The final split will be determined by the final evaluation of projects. Dennis Fay presented the sustainability principle — the idea that over 30 years in order to provide the same operating funds in real terms, the funding would need to triple in nominal terms. He presented a graph that showed how the program could be structured such that the proportion of funds allocated to operating could begin as 25% of revenue but by year 30 would consume 75% of revenue. Howard Goode commented that that this type of structure poses a risk of triggering an increase in funds demanded by transit operators. It was agreed that there would need to be maintenance of effort and farebox recovery requirements to minimize this.